

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7-8, and 10-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-5 and 8-11 were rejected; Claims 6 and 7 were objected to; Claims 5, 6, and 9 were canceled; Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, and 11 were amended; and claims 12-15 were added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

An amendment was made to the specification to correct an error of a typographical nature. No new matter has been added by the amendment to the specification.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Particularly, the Office Action states that the graphical user interface objects including original, translated, and symbolic identifiers are not shown in the Figures. Applicants have submitted proposed corrections to drawings labeled Figure 2 as suggested by the examiner in red ink. The proposed corrections show exemplary graphical user object identifiers, translated identifiers, and symbolic identifiers as described in the present application (See Page 8, Line 13-Page 9, Line 2; Page 9, Lines 19-24). No new matter has been introduced by the proposed corrections to the drawings. These changes will be incorporated into a formal set of drawings upon approval of the proposed changes by the examiner.

I. 37 CFR 1.75 – Double Patenting

Claim 9 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 8. Claim 9 has been cancelled, and the double patenting objection is now moot.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action has rejected claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. Particularly, the Office Action states that claims 8-11 lack adequate formatting to distinguish organizational elements of the claims because it is not clear which elements make up a package. Claim 8 has been amended to provide adequate formatting to distinguish the organization of the claim elements such that it is clear which elements make up the package. Therefore,

withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Office Action has rejected claims 1, 4, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,067,639 to Rodrigues et al. (hereinafter Rodrigues) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,664,206 to Murow et al. (hereinafter Murow). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of allowed claim 6 and intervening claim 5 (both now cancelled). Thus, claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Additionally, claim 8 has been amended to recite similar features as claim 1. Therefore, the same distinctions between Rodrigues and Murow and the claimed invention in claim 1 apply for claim 8. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 8 is now in condition for allowance.

Since claim 4 depends from claim 1, the same distinctions between Rodrigues and Murow and the claimed invention in claim 1 apply for claim 4. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 1, 4, and 8 have been overcome, and such a notice is respectfully requested.

Additionally, the Office Action has rejected claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodrigues in view of Murow and further in view of "Norton Ghost" by Darkangel (hereinafter Darkangel). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Darkangel describes a mechanism of backing up a hard disk by creating an image file of the hard disk. The image file can then be restored onto another hard disk. Darkangel provides for none of the deficiencies of Rodrigues and Murow for testing a computer program translated into a national language.

Inasmuch as allowable base claim 1 includes elements not shown or described in dependent claims 2 and 3, the same distinctions between Rodrigues, Murow, and Darkangel and the claimed invention in claim 1 apply for these claims. Moreover, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending

therefrom is non-obvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, claims 2 and 3 are non-obvious as Applicants have already demonstrated claim 1 to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 and 3 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence on an allowable base claim.

Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to recite features similar to allowable claim 1. Therefore, the same distinctions between Rodrigues, Murow, and Darkangel and the claimed invention in claim 1 apply for claims 10 and 11. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 11 are now in condition for allowance, and such a notice is respectfully requested.

Newly added claims 12-14 recite features similar to claims 2-4 demonstrated above to be allowable. Therefore, the same distinctions between Rodrigues, Murow, and Darkangel and the claimed invention in claims 2-4 apply for claims 12-14. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 12-14 are in condition for allowance, and such a notice is respectfully requested.

Newly added claim 15 is directed to a computer program product that facilitates testing of a program translated into a national language. Claim 15 recites the following:

15. A computer program product on a computer readable medium that facilitates testing of a program translated into a national language, the computer program product comprising:

an original program in an original language that has a graphical user interface that generates a plurality of graphical objects each having a respective original identifier;

a set of original scripts defining test commands for showing user-visible text messages of the original program and including an original declaration module that associates each respective original identifier with a symbolic identifier;

a translated program obtained from a translation of the original program that has a graphical user interface that generates a plurality of objects each having a respective translated identifier associated with a symbolic identifier; and

a set of translated scripts defining test commands for showing user-visible text messages of the translated program, wherein the set of translated scripts include a translated declaration module that associates each translated identifier with a symbolic identifier, wherein the translated scripts are obtained from the original scripts by replacing each original identifier of the original declaration module with a corresponding translated identifier, and wherein each respective original identifier and the corresponding translated identifier that replaces the original identifier have a common symbolic identifier.

As described in the present application, a program in an original language is translated into a translated program. The original program generates graphical objects each having an original identifier. An original configuration module of the original program defines data structures and procedures of the original program including graphical objects, such as a dialog, and the original identifiers of the graphical objects, such as a dialog title (Page 6, Lines 1-14). A set of test scripts define test commands and include an original declaration module that associates a symbolic identifier with a respective original identifier of a graphical object. The set of test scripts defines a test case for showing user-visible text messages of the original program. Each graphical object of the original program is referenced in the test commands by a symbolic identifier associated with the original identifier (Page 6, Lines 21-29). The translated program has a graphical user interface that generates graphical objects that have translated identifiers (Page 7, Lines 15-24). A set of translated scripts that define test commands of a test case that show user-visible text messages of the translated program is obtained by generating a translated declaration module. The translated declaration module is produced by replacing original identifiers of graphical objects that are parsed or otherwise read from the original declaration module with translated identifiers that have a matching or common symbolic identifier associated therewith (Page 7, Line 26-Page 8, Line 6).

Thus, the translated declaration module is formatted similar to the original declaration module but has translated identifiers for the graphical objects of the translated program. The translated declaration module, in conjunction with a command module, may then be run by a play module for evaluation of the translated program.

Rodrigues generally describes a mechanism for testing a computer program that includes a sample of test data and a script oriented test tool. Test suites are recorded by the test tool in play back files. Particularly, Rodrigues provides functions in a runtime library DLL so that test operation objects are instantiated by function calls to the DLL (Column 1, Lines 21-26, Lines 34-36; and Column 4, Lines 17-27). Rodrigues is silent with regard to testing of a translated program and thus fails to describe or suggest “a translated program...that has a graphical user interface that generates a plurality of objects each having a respective translated identifier associated with a symbolic identifier”, “a set of translated scripts defining test commands for showing user-visible

text messages of the translated program”, “a translated declaration module that associates each translated identifier with a symbolic identifier”, or a mechanism for obtaining translated scripts “from the original scripts by replacing each original identifier” of an original declaration module with a “corresponding translated identifier” that have a common symbolic identifier.

Murow generally describes a mechanism for creating a localized version of a software product. A localization kit guides a user in the step of localizing a target computer program. A target computer program includes a first portion of the target computer program which has not been localized and a second portion which is localized and combined with the first portion. The localization kit combines the localized material with the target computer program to produce the localized version of the target computer program. Murow fails to describe or suggest production of “a translated program...that has a graphical user interface that generates a plurality of objects each having a respective translated identifier associated with a symbolic identifier”, “a set of translated scripts defining test commands for showing user-visible text messages of the translated program”, “a translated declaration module that associates each translated identifier with a symbolic identifier”, or a mechanism for obtaining translated scripts “from the original scripts by replacing each original identifier” of an original declaration module with a “corresponding translated identifier” that have a common symbolic identifier.

Darkangel describes a program for making a hard disk back up and provides for none of the deficiencies of Rodrigues or Murow. Thus, Rodrigues, Murow, and Darkangel are insufficient, alone or in any combination thereof, to obviate the subject invention as described and recited in claim 15.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over Rodrigues, Murow, and Darkangel and is now in condition for allowance, and such a notice is respectfully requested.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: October 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. McDonald', is written over a horizontal line.

Steven T. McDonald
Reg. No. 45,999
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Agent for Applicant